

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the description to correct a typographical error.

Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claims 23, 24, and 25.

Claim 22 has been amended. Support for the amendment of Claim 22 appears in the specification at least at page 24, lines 24-30.

The headings below are numbered to correspond with the heading numbering used by the Examiner in the Office Action.

4. Claims 22-25 satisfy 35 U.S.C. 101.

The Examiner states:

The phrase "A computer program product comprising" is not necessarily embodied software on computer readable media (subject to inclusion of said subject matter in the specification) corresponding to a method of said embodied software. (Office Action, page 2, emphasis added.)

To expedite prosecution, Claim 22 has been amended to recite:

A computer program product comprising a tangible computer readable medium containing computer program code comprising:

an exception handling validation application for hooking an exception handler dispatcher;

said exception handling validation application further for stalling execution of said exception handler dispatcher upon invocation of said exception handler dispatcher; and

said exception handling validation application further for determining whether an exception handling is valid, wherein upon a determination that said exception handling is valid, said exception handling validation application further for allowing said execution of said exception handler dispatcher to proceed. (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, Claim 22 satisfies 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims 23, 24, 25, which depend from Claim 22, satisfy 35 U.S.C. 101 for at least the same reasons as Claim 22.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

5. Claims 1, 14, 16, 21 and 22 are novel over Xenitellis.

Initially, Applicant notes that the Examiner only lists Claims 1, 14, 16, 21 (not Claim 22) as being rejected at heading 5 at page 2 of the Office Action. However, at pages 4-5, a detailed rejection of Claim 22 appears. Accordingly, Applicant assumes that Claim 22 along with Claims 1, 14, 16, 21, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xenitellis and clarification is requested.

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states:

hooking an exception handler dispatcher [Section 1-5, whereas in an 'event driven model' with the associated **system event dispatcher** called as part of the operating system kernel, and associated modification or not upon '**condition interception** [i.e., after subsequent hooking]' response, encompasses the claimed limitations as broadly interpreted by the examiner.] ... (Office Action, page 3, emphasis added.)

The Examiner's statement is respectfully traversed. Xenitellis teaches that **event messages** are intercepted and the Examiner has failed to callout where Xenitellis teaches or suggests that the **event dispatcher** is hooked.

As an introduction, Xenitellis teaches:

An event-driven system ... is a system of objects which interact with each other using a **message-passing mechanism**. The **mechanism is controlled by a distinct component that is usually called the event dispatcher**, and acts as an intermediary between objects. ... The **objects receive events in the form of event messages**, typically of fixed length and made up of an event type

identifier and the event parameters. (Section 1, Introduction, emphasis added.)

Accordingly, Xenitellis teaches that the event dispatcher is not the same as an event message.

With regards to the "condition interception" as cited by the Examiner, in section 4.2, Xenitellis teaches:

Condition Interception requires that objects must be able to intercept **event messages** from other objects. This includes **unprivileged objects intercepting events of objects of higher privilege**. (Emphasis added.)

Further, Xenitellis teaches that the condition interception is a condition that results in a security vulnerability. To illustrate, Xenitellis teaches in section 4.4, entitled "Types of vulnerabilities":

These types are classified by the security effect of the exploitation, and along with the descriptions we provide the **conditions that need to be met so that each attack is possible**. (Emphasis added.)

To further illustrate, in section 4.4.5, Xenitellis teaches:

Conditions Enumeration and **Interception** must be met in order to identify the victim object and intercept the events destined to it. Being able to intercept the events sent to an object allows the **attacker** to breach the confidentiality of only one direction of the object communication with the system. (Emphasis added.)

For at least these reasons, Xenitellis does not teach or suggest:

A method comprising:
hooking an exception handler dispatcher;
stalling execution of said exception handler dispatcher upon invocation of said exception handler dispatcher; and
determining whether an exception handling is valid, wherein upon a determination that said exception

handling is valid, said method further comprising allowing said execution of said exception handler dispatcher to proceed,

as recited in Claim 1, emphasis added. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over Xenitellis. Claims 14, 16, which depend from Claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Claim 22 is allowable for reasons similar to Claim 1.


Claim 21 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of Claims 23, 24, and 25. Accordingly, Claim 21 is allowable over Xenitellis.

Conclusion.

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING


I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 10, 2007



Attorney for Applicant(s)

May 10, 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Serge J. Hodgson
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,017
Tel.: (831) 655-0880